

Steens Mountain Advisory SMAC
Meeting Minutes
January 24 and 25, 2002

Members Present:

Jerry Sutherland, Environmental Representative – Statewide, Portland, Oregon
Alice Elshoff, Environmental Representative – Local, Frenchglen, Oregon
Hoyt Wilson, Grazing Permittee, Princeton, Oregon
E Ron Harding, Wild Horse Management, Burns, Oregon
Jason Miner, Fish and Recreational Fishing, Portland, Oregon
Cynthia Witzel, Recreational Permit Holder, Frenchglen, Oregon
Tom Harris, Mechanized or Consumptive Recreation, Keno, Oregon
Stacy Davies, Grazing Permittee, Frenchglen, Oregon
Harland Yriarte, Private Landowner, Eugene, Oregon
Steve Purchase, State Liaison, Salem, Oregon

Members Absent:

Roger Alfred, No Financial Interest, Portland, Oregon
Wanda Johnson, Burns Paiute Tribe, Burns, Oregon
Thomas Wendel, Dispersed Recreation, Burns, Oregon

Designated Federal Official (DFO):

Joan Suther, Acting Steens Mountain Project Manager, Bureau of Land
Management, (BLM), Hines, Oregon

Designated Federal Official Assistants:

Rhonda Karges, Management Support Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Liz Appelman, Budget Analyst, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Patti Wilson, Management Support Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Presenters:

Wayne Bowers, ODFW
Jim Buchanan, Range Management Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Mary Emerick, Wilderness Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Gary Foulkes, Environmental Planner, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Jim Lemos, ODFW
Skip Renschler, Realty Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Jeff Rose, Fire Ecologist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Lesley Richman, Weed Coordinator, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Mark Sherbourne, Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Cindy Weston, Fish Biologist, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Facilitator:

Dale White

Commenting Public:

Susan Hammond, Hammond Ranches
C.M. Otley, Diamond Valley Ranch
Bill Otley, Diamond Valley Ranch
Fred Otley, Landowner
Ed Davis, Permittee

Others Present: (Sign-in Sheet)

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Mark Armstrong, BLM | |
| Linda Driskill, Grant County Conservationists | |
| Richard Roy, Malheur National Wildlife Refuge | |
| Tom Glass, Western Land Group, Inc. | |
| Ray Hermit BLM | |
| Sandy Berain, BLM | |
| John Snyder, Congressman Walden's Office | |
| Matt Obradovich, BLM | Michael Weston, BLM |
| Tom Dyer, BLM | Jill Benefield, BLM |
| Jim King, BLM | Lance Okeson, BLM |
| Dan Nichols, Commissioner | Scott Hamilton, BLM |
| Mike Benefield, BLM | Evelyn Trieman, BLM |
| Kelly Hazen, BLM | Dave Toney, BLM |
| Mike Williams, BLM | Darrin Brumback, BLM |

Welcome, Introductions, Housekeeping, Agenda review:

Tom Harris called the meeting to order, requesting introductions from SMAC members and those in the audience. Rhonda reviewed the schedule, new mileage rate, and the acronym and phone number extension list.

Consensus Decision: The proposed letterhead is acceptable.

Tom Harris read a letter from Miles Brown, DFO, explaining the reasons for his absence and apologizing to the group for missing the meeting.

Jerry briefed members on his proposals for meeting process. Members discussed the various proposals.

Consensus Decision: Eliminate the Number 4: "If members are giving a presentation and want an interested party or experts to be involved, those individuals should be listed on the agenda. This way Patti doesn't have to make up sheets and hang them on the wall every time." Renumber to make 5 into number 4. Remove Rhonda's name under who is to receive notes and replace it with DFO.

SMAC members discussed the process for presenting opposing views on any item and the importance of the SMAC being able to hear all sides of an issue.

Consensus Decision: If the SMAC feels they do not have enough information on an issue, there would be the opportunity to provide it at the next meeting.

Revisit December Meeting:

Decision/Followup Items: The SMAC reviewed the list updating it as appropriate.

Minutes: Members reviewed some of the proposed changes to the minutes. It was determined a better approach would be to give any additional changes to Rhonda, who will make them on the draft minutes. The group can then review all of them at one time tomorrow.

Harland shared with the group the writings of a college student who had written a piece about the Steens and the love of the Mountain.

Roaring Springs Land Exchange:

Skip Renschler updated the SMAC based on the SMAC's recommendation for the BLM to accept the water gap reservation in this exchange. The second part of the recommendation was to seek judicial relief, which is in process. The third part was to seek legislative adjustment to the boundary. The exchange is moving forward and staff has begun work on the Fred Otley exchange.

Subcommittee Reports

Signs:

Harland Yriarte reviewed the subcommittee's report with the SMAC. Although the information gathered indicates a need for some general informational as well as identification-type signs, there should be as few as possible, constructed of native material, and should blend in with the scenery. Included in the signs could be some of the words from various languages of people who used the Mountain. A kiosk, but not in a view shed, should be provided at the entrances, something simple but informative with a brochure and a system of registration. The group talked of possible ways to design the signs and it was suggested consulting be done with BLM and others to see what has been their experience. The SMAC also recognized the pros and cons of any signing of private property and the need to work in cooperation with the landowners on this process.

Past surveys show the majority of visitors come from 300 to 600 miles away, and the SMAC discussed ways to ensure recreating public is informed of the changes as a result of the legislation. The SMAC discussed how best to educate people without marketing the Mountain since the goal is education. Possible ways to accomplish this are brochures, working in concert with other agencies, and public meeting

opportunities. The SMAC discussed Law Enforcement, safety issues on the Mountain, and personal responsibility.

The SMAC was asked if there was any objection to Jill Benefield speaking about what has occurred as far as signs and any plans for the future. No objection was heard.

Jill Benefield introduced herself to the SMAC as working for the Recreation Program on the District. Jill updated the SMAC on the group that had been established prior to the dedication, the MOU that had been completed then, and the work completed on the design of the signs currently in place. This initial group did a lot of research and discussion and Jill has the information available for the SMAC. How to meet the requirements of the increasing number of visitors is still under consideration.

The SMAC discussed the need to ensure everything is done cooperatively, the ways to approach the sign and educational needs, and to keep moving forward with meeting the needs. There are items that must be dealt with immediately such as safety and the requirements of the legislation. The SMAC discussed the requirements set out by the NLCS office and how to meet them as well as find a creative approach to meeting the needs on the Mountain given its unique designation.

Jill reviewed the signs currently awaiting installation, which are basically traffic-type signs within and around campgrounds.

Because the committee had completed their information gathering, the SMAC determined that now it would be volunteers who would consult with BLM and continue working on this. Alice, Cindy, Harland, Tom Harris all volunteered. It was decided Alice Elshoff would be the main contact.

Public Comments:

Susan Hammond, Hammond Ranches, expressed concern that the recreation plan address both summer and winter programs and there seemed to be a move to discontinue some historic uses. She told the group Hammond Ranches, Inc., has 4000-5000 acres within historic snowmobile use area and have always allowed snowmobiles on their private property. She is concerned if it is the decision to remove snowmobiles on public land, they would move to private and put lots of pressure on the private land. She felt the private landowner would have no choice but to develop it commercially. Another point of concern was the possibility of an interpretive center being built and it seemed like the people in Frenchglen had been left completely out of the loop. The Frenchglen community has done a lot of work on plans for the future for the community itself and she feels the community should be in on any discussions for development.

Brent Fenty, ONDA, thanked everyone at this meeting for serving on SMAC to fulfill the cooperative nature of the Act. He urged the SMAC to reconsider holding meetings elsewhere, since many of the visitors to the Mountain do come from 300 to 600 miles away. He believes for people to perceive this process as legitimate, they need to be aware it is taking place. His concern is perhaps not a lot of people outside the immediate vicinity know the process is taking place.

Charlie Otley, Diamond rancher, proposed elevational signs as being a good idea, since some visitors have heart conditions and are not aware of the changes in elevation. Mr. Otley spoke of past committees who have been involved in managing the Steens. He spoke of the publics right to use the land as they have in the past.

Bill Otley, Diamond rancher, related how his family has always cooperated with the public in allowing recreation on their private land. Recently, some of the roads on the Mountain have been closed, putting pressure on their private land since people can no longer access their usual camping or recreating locations. The ranch has had several incidents this last year. Although he realizes a few can spoil things for a lot of people, the increase in incidents is a major concern. Also because of the road closures, ATV traffic has placed much more pressure on private land.

RMP:

Gary Foulkes distributed copies of the Analysis of the Management Situation and Sub-basin Review (AMS/SBR) document to give SMAC members a chance to review it this evening in preparation of discussing it tomorrow. He reminded the SMAC the RMP scoping meetings start next month and encouraged members to attend any of the meetings. Jerry noted the Draft Southeast Oregon RMP said all comments specific to Andrews would go into our EIS.

Subcommittee Reports:

Winter Recreation:

Cindy Witzel reviewed the current status of winter on the Mountain and distributed maps identifying current and potential areas of use, trails, etc. Both winter and summer recreation programs are struggling with how to define a trail, the width, etc. The BLM has been asked to go to the solicitor for an interpretation of the Section 112 of the Act, but has not yet heard back. Cindy discussed the need for long-term planning to ensure the public demand can be addressed. There is a difference of opinion as to the interpretation of the current management plans in place. Jerry distributed a copy of the research he had done on snowmobile use.

SRP Handbooks:

The SMAC felt the SRP Handbook should be better organized and easier to read, more user friendly. Even though it is basically an internal document, those applying for permits will be using it to ensure they meet the requirements. Some of the handbook points out the specific rules or laws while other parts do not. It should be consistent throughout.

The SMAC discussed the issues associated with day use as well and how it should be handled and how to determine when it would require a permit. Members felt those having SRPs for Steens prior to the legislation have priority on the Mountain now; however, the SMAC wanted it understood this does not necessarily apply to the rest of the District. The group does also recognize many of these uses are planned well in advance and need to apply for a permit at that time.

In order to be able to meet future uses, it is necessary to know what is currently occurring. SMAC discussed the various means of accomplishing the necessary data gathering. It is believed this information will be critical to determine threshold levels in the RMP.

Consensus Decision: Recommend to BLM a monitoring system on recreation be created to be put into place soon. Cindy Witzel volunteered and it is agreed she will work with the BLM staff as the SMAC representative.

Consensus Decision: The interim special recreation permit handbook be revised to the minimum needed to accommodate the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Act of 2000 (Act) and existing regulations; any permits issued prior to the management plan being final would be considered temporary permits; the special recreation permits will continue to exist with any modifications under the EA process they are going through to accommodate the Act and regulations brought in as a result of it.

SRP Update:

Mark Sherbourne informed the SMAC the BLM is in the process of reauthorizing the eight existing special recreation permit holders. The requested information has been received from seven. Resource input will be received from BLM staff on the three planned EAs (one for the running camp, one for those permittees who are primarily hunting and fishing, and one for permit holders who conduct tours, hiking, horseback riding, etc.). Currently the schedule is to have EAs out to the public the last week of March. There will be a 30-day comment period then the Decision Records will be issued about the middle of May, with permits to follow by June 1. Mark informed the group under the 8372 regulations, even if an appeal is received, the permits would still be allowed.

Interim Management Policy:

The SMAC Members discussed the various changes proposed by members. A motion was made to accept the IMP as amended with Stacy's and Cindy's changes, but without Jerry's.

The question was called for and an objection to consensus was heard.

Role Call Vote:

Tom Harris - Yes
Ron Harding - Yes
Cindy - Yes
Harland - Yes
Stacy - Yes
Hoyt - Yes
Jason - No
Jerry - No
Alice - No

The SMAC determined since the DFO represents the Secretary, this required 9 affirmative votes to pass. Not receiving that number, the motion failed.

After a lengthy discussion, the group agreed to endeavor to go through Jerry's proposed changes tomorrow to see where consensus could be reached.

Wildlands Juniper Management Area/Juniper Management EA:

Jeff Rose spoke to the SMAC about the juniper wildland management area and western juniper management in general. He noted juniper is a big issue on some of the lands under BLM jurisdiction. In his Power Point presentation, he relayed information about juniper, its lifecycle, trends, impacts on it from fire, age of some trees, cycles of invasion or encroachment, and the impacts on other plant and animal communities. He discussed various means of treatment, possible management tools, the value of aspen stands, and means to educate people on what is being done.

Jeff put forth the idea the management of this area could be a collaborative effort with universities, the SMAC, and the Science group, as well as other agencies.

Jeff talked of the possibilities the entire Mountain could be used as a demonstration area. The research could be a component of the management tools and expand outside the designated 3000-acre juniper management area.

January 25, 2002

The meeting was reconvened.

Questions from Monday:

Informational needs - In order to keep SMAC members informed of discussions and happenings between meetings, a thumbnail sketch of what had occurred was requested. The group thought it would be helpful to have a briefing by the chair at the beginning of each meeting.

Minutes – The SMAC discussed all the proposed changes to the minutes.

Consensus Decision: Move red highlighted sentences down below nomination of Jerry Sutherland and to strike the word ‘only’. The minutes be approved as amended.

AMS/Subbasin Review:

Gary Foulkes, reviewed the RMP process, the scoping brochure will be mailed, the planned scoping meetings, and press coverage. The scoping period ends April 15, the remainder of the spring will be formulating issues and the alternatives for the EIS. The public will have a chance to review those in June of 2002. Writing on the RMP/EIS will begin in July 2002 and tentatively a draft will be issued in August 2003.

The SMAC pointed out errors in the AMS/SBR. Gary reiterated the AMS/SBR is not a decision document but an attempt to describe the current management situation and current resource situation. Any errors identified can be corrected and addressed in the RMP.

The contractor is working on a summary of the AMS/SBR, which will be issued shortly.

The document distributed to this group is currently for internal review only. Once the official document is printed after going through the process to the State Office, it will be available for the public.

Weeds:

According to Lesley Richman, Weed Coordinator for the District, the local weed program is probably one of the best in the nation. Fortunately, in Harney County, there is a relatively small amount of noxious weeds and focusing on education and awareness is the best way to maintain or reduce the level. The weed group, which is comprised of different federal, state and county agencies, organizations, and private individuals, is doing innovative and different things to bring attention to the

problem. They have devised stadium seats to sell, as well as a booklet on noxious weeds.

Lesley briefed the SMAC on the specific populations of concern within the CMPA and what is being done to control or eradicate them. Tracking of the infestations is being done through GIS thereby providing a detailed historical record.

The increase in visitors to the mountain bring a proportionate increase in risk of weed infestation and the means to control this needs to continue to be monitored.

Lesley is willing to provide any information to the SMAC they would like, she would also provide programs at local schools if requested.

Stonehouse AMP EA:

Jim Buchanan, BLM Range Management Specialist, gave a brief background on the allotment, a physical description of the allotment, the plants and animals within it, and the management of it to date, including the AMP/EA. Jim described the prescribed burn plans, process, issues and implementation progress.

Jim Lemos related ODFW is very involved because the area under consideration is very important, containing numerous wildlife, redband trout, a major area for sage grouse brood rearing and is a mule deer fawning area. The problems in the area are ecological as well as grazing.

Both men emphasized timing is of utmost importance when looking at the prescribed fire issues, not only for the resources on the ground, but the permit holder as well.

Discussion ensued on the necessity to keep the EA separate from the EIS process, and the need not to defer decisions for the time period needed to complete the EIS process.

It was moved and seconded the SMAC recommend the EA process be separate from EIS.

Discussion: Jerry thought there was probably a very good reason to do that but requested it be deferred until next month. The motion was tabled as long as it comes back on the next meeting agenda.

Public Input:

Susan Hammond, Hammond Ranches, agreed with Jeff Rose's presentation and talked of fire and its impacts on the resources on the Mountain. She believed the collaborative process is important and a need to increase the size of the demonstration area. She also felt there needed to be some way to get past the liability to private landowners if they are using fire as a management tool on their own land and it escapes onto government property.

Charlie Otley, Diamond rancher, stated he read Jerry Sutherland's information on snowmobiles and would like to point out he never read a positive word in it, the entire document was all negative. He heard Jerry mention Steens Mountain Act, but never did he hear him mention the word cooperative in any way and seems it is all about wilderness. If it is wilderness Jerry appears to be all for it, if it is not then Jerry is against it. Charlie felt he was one step above Jerry, in that he, Charlie, allows anyone use of the Mountain and believes he has no right to stop that use. Charlie was asked to refrain from personal attacks.

Fred Otley, Diamond rancher, stated a couple of things bother him. When reviewing the Act, it contains fairly balanced language in terms of use and has emphasized over and over the word cooperative management. He is getting the feeling the SMAC is starting at worst, most restrictive, regulatory part and moving back from it. He really doesn't think that is consistent with the Act and provided two examples. Eight permittees have been following the rules, yet still must go through NEPA and don't know if they are going to be able to operate. As far as he is concerned, those permittees should be operating automatically under the interim management. The other concern is wilderness management. Some things were in the process and now are being considered to have to wait until the EIS. It cannot be both ways, since it was in the process, work on it should continue. Both BLM and Ed Davis have spent substantial monies to move to this point and progress should not be halted.

He believes the BLM and SMAC have a responsibility not only on current use, but to readdress historical use in a broader sense. It does not matter who was right or who wasn't.

Ed Davis, Alvord Ranch, wanted to make a point in his exchange at the Kueny Ranch. He thought the understanding was there would be no significant change in permit use once the private was moved out of BLM and the area was made whole. He was told his use would be grandfathered in. As soon as it was completed, he was informed mechanized use could not occur except under certain conditions. He now doesn't see where there is any understanding the ranch has been guaranteed use of their practices that have been occurring for generations. He would like this Board to see if there is some way these "grandfathered" uses and practices have some real rights. He believes the BLM said this in good faith that these practices could continue, but wants to ensure it is clear to all this is the not case. One of the concerns revolves around the requirements the ranch designate up front how many trips will be needed into the wilderness area. If more are needed, will they be denied? Mr. Davis felt it was almost impossible to accurately determine the trips, since unforeseen events occur on a regular basis.

The SMAC discussed various aspects of this concern including the impacts of the Wilderness Act, the possible exclusion by omission, and means to clarify what is mandatory.

The question was asked if the environmental coalition had a plan for what was to happen on the Mountain in the future. Is it to get the entire mountain into the public hands and then not allow the public to use it? How cooperative is this SMAC? Jerry said he is representing all environmentalists not just the coalition and there is no plan or document as to what the Steens will look like in the future. If you go talk to his constituents, you will have as many visions for the Steens as you do members.

It was acknowledged those involved in these discussions at this table are all fairly impassioned and is the reason the discussions get heated.

Redband Trout:

Cindy Weston introduced Wayne Bowers the District Fish Biologist for ODFW stationed in Hines. He has been in the area since 1973. He gave an overview of redband trout, the three listed fish species in the area, the geographic aspects involved, the creeks and streams in the area, the biological diversity of the species and the cooperative agreements currently in place. Wayne responded to questions by the SMAC on stocking, trout migration, rearing areas, fishing restrictions, adaptability of fish to changing conditions, and fish food sources.

Jason Miner identified the boundaries of the redband trout reserve and the biology associated with it. He also discussed the purposes listed in the Act for the reserve. The area is to be analyzed to see how well the redband species lives. The Act included a few specific actions, if funded, could be undertaken. One is a scientific study among interested parties to determine pros and cons of removing the dam at Page Springs. Also in the Act are possibilities of pursuing outreach and education.

DFO Update:

Wilderness Access Update: Mary Emerick reported work is progressing on this. She has asked the permittees and inholders to tell her what they need and why. She wants to ensure the justification for the necessary access will meet the requirements. The scoping meetings with BLM specialists have taken place, and she is awaiting further information from a couple of specialists. Skip is working on setting up meetings with the landowners. The full scope of this is not yet known, since many of the parcels are quite small and the owners do not live in the area. The way this process seems to be working is she asks a series of questions, i.e., what routes do you need, how is it needed, how often, and is there any access that is not needed? The timeline to complete all this is fairly restricted. Once she receives the information from the landowners and specialists she will put together the EA and give it to the SMAC for review. She anticipates April 1 for the grazing EA and May 1 for the inholders unless access is needed prior to that date.

Members of the SMAC expressed concern over how “adequate” or “reasonable” access is determined. Mary stated she would try to include in the EA what would be required if emergency or unanticipated access becomes necessary.

Followup Item: Mary was asked to make a list of court cases on lawsuits over access issues.

DFO: Joan brought up the subject of beginning the process to publish a Federal Register Notice about requesting nominations for those 1-year terms that are ending (Alice, Hoyt, Tom Wendell and Ron).

Consensus Decision: Since the SMAC realizes it takes a long time to get a Federal Register Notice through the process, the nomination process be started now for the 1-year member terms that will be ending.

Range Improvement Funding: As a result of the SMAC letter to the State Director, ways were found to fund the projects, but it still looks like the BLM will be about \$100,000 short, yet more money may follow.

Stacy brought up the SMAC needs to be aware any letters sent back to Washington may take a considerable amount of time, so it is important to complete them as early as possible.

Part of what needs to be done could be accomplished through the use of volunteers, but this cannot be the sole alternative. Jerry asked that the reference to volunteers in the funding chart regarding fence removals be deleted and that removal of fences in WSAs be added.

RMP Scoping Meetings: Members volunteered to attend the meetings as follows:

Burns – Stacy, Jason, Steve, Jerry, Ron, Harland, Hoyt, Tom H.

Frenchglen - Stacy, Cindy

Bend - Tom Harris, Stacy, Alice

Portland – Hoyt, Jason, Steve, Jerry, maybe Harland

Common theme on several topics: One recurring discussion has been on short-term and long-term planning processes with some folks wanting to put everything in RMP some items need a quicker resolution than that. Perhaps the group should talk about whether or not they want to be involved in every EA that is being written for the entire planning area or want just a list of all EAs and then make a determination of the level of SMAC’s involvement.

The SMAC discussed the various levels of possible involvement.

Consensus Decision: Request a list of projects for the SMAC to review and determine ones in which to become involved.

Followup Item: List of projects.

Interim Management Plan:

Jerry Sutherland walked the group through his proposed changes for the IMP.

- Put it in outline form to ease readability.
- Be consistent on referencing or not referencing laws.
- Page 2 is correct the way it is.
- NEPA reference isn't there like in previous sentence.
- Page 3 change 'coordinated through' to 'discussed with'.

Followup Item: Provide copy of 43 CFR 4700 to SMAC members.

- How work is accomplished with wildlife agencies should be added to wildlife management section just like it was on ranching
- If the Paleo section is only here to provide the regulations, then there is no point in having it. At least a discussion on the impacts of the CMPA or wilderness should be included.
- Page 6 take 'continue' out of the sentence under recreation.
- Refer to EAs as something that is being done
- Remove Interim Special Recreation Permit

Cindy pointed out what was agreed upon yesterday also needs to be placed in the existing discussion.

- Page 7 just adding reference.
- Reports on fire crews in wilderness or WSAs can be requested by Jerry rather than it being the entire SMAC. There are regulations governing crews while in Wilderness or WSAs.
- Eliminate the last one.
- Page 6: Cross out everything that refers to snowmobiles in the transportation system management section. Remove all the bold type. Leave "unless modified by the Act."

The above changes to the IMP do not reflect the comprehensive changes as discussed at the meeting, but rather the summarized version of the changes.

Consensus Decision: The BLM adopt the IMP, as amended by the SMAC.

The following is an excerpt from a letter from Tom Harris, SMAC Chair, to BLM: Adopt the Interim Management Policy (IMP) as amended by the SMAC. The amendments were discussed in length and the discussion can be found in the meeting minutes. The major point of contention was the section on "Transportation System Management." The group agreed everything bolded under this section from "Parking of motorized vehicles . . ." to " . . . winter recreation experience on the

mountain.” be deleted. The paragraph would then consist of the first and last sentences. Other changes to the IMP were minor.

Critique on Meeting:

- commended the BLM staff for doing a wonderful job
- appreciation for the audience attendance
- appreciated the presentations both by BLM staff and others to help SMAC get a better understanding of on-the-ground issues.
- very important for each member to be here and have their input
- tried to accommodate too much in the agenda.
- Provide revised minutes the first day, but put approval discussion on the second day.
- Talk too much about process.
- Don't put decision items toward the end of the day.
- Maybe end the meetings a little earlier like at 4:30
- Perhaps schedule a break out time where the interested parties need to talk
- Covered a lot of ground
- If landowners feel they haven't been dealt with very fairly, it is possible locked gates could result and should be avoided at all cost. Everyone is going to have to give and take, and concerned the environmental community is not prepared to do that.
- Appreciated the pretty good natured discussions.
- Refreshing to see everyone here is willing to speak their mind
- With three people absent a consensus vote becomes almost impossible.
- Discomfort with the public comment - appeared to be a personal attack. Perhaps it should be added to audience guidelines not to do public attack.
- Like change where have 2 days for public input
- Would like to see all members attend the evening dinner to be able to spend time in a relaxed atmosphere.
- Schedule constituency meetings at other times
- Personal attack should have been stopped earlier.
- Appreciated all the work Jerry did on the research on snowmobile use.

Agenda for next meeting:

Do have some action items:

Winter recreation information gathering
SMAC meeting process implementation feed back
Juniper management direction recommendation and possibly include funding and maybe a field trip
Stonehouse EA
Signing and education: Cindy, Alice, Harland, and Jill
Self-issue permits (CMPA recreation use monitoring)
Check on redband trout reserve funding – Jason and Tom Harris
Weed involvement
Cultural resources
Wild Horses

Ask presenters to focus in a little bit to issues the SMAC needs to be aware of.

Agenda items would compliment each other in the context of this meeting.

Consensus Decision: Ask Steve McCool to come, provided funding is available, with optional speakers if it can be arranged.

The SMAC approved the meeting minutes as amended on March 1, 2002.

Certified by:

Tom Harris, Chair

Date